GS.IV **There are sufficient numbers of administrators, teachers, related services providers, paraprofessi onals, and other providers to meet the identified educational needs of all children with disabilities in the state.**

1. **Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):**

Number (FTE) of Employed Fully Certified Perso nnel			
Position	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Special Education Teachers	8,077.31	7,967.81	8,455.02
Early Childhood Special Education Teachers	462.51	525.79	604.70
Process Coordinators	498.15	314.75	414.82
Special Education Directors	220.07	420.15	430.17
Paraprofessionals	7,298.82	7,015.42	7,226.27
Other Special Education and Related Services Personnel	1,193.21	1,248.99	1,345.03

Total (FTE) Employed Teachers and Child Count School-Age			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
2000-2001	8,696.64	129,345	14.87
2001-2002	8,757.27	132,626	15.14
2002-2003	9,159.93	134,118	14.64

Early Childhood Special Education			
Year	FTE Teachers	Child Count	Student/Teacher Ratio
2000-2001	552.63	8,036	14.54
2001-2002	597.18	9,022	15.11
2002-2003	668.03	10,049	15.04

Source: Child count data from Screen 11 of Core Data Collection System as of 02/20/04. Personnel data from 618 data reported on OSEP Table 2

Data show that numbers of special education personnel are generally increasing and that student/teacher ratios are reasonable. This is a statewide analysis and there are likely regional shortages. The Division is currently exploring options for changing/enhancing the data collection on special education personnel. The current collection only provides case management data and does not really demonstrate how special education teachers are spending their time or what sorts of delivery models are being utilized throughout the state. Regional analysis is needed as better data become available.

Monitoring Data:

General Administration 4 -- The public agency identifies and implements activities to support a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) as required

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	93	1	0	1	1		1.1%
2002-2003	95	2	0	2	2		2.1%

Indicator A 101800 -- CSPD activities have been implemented

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	92	1	0	1	1		1.1%
2002-2003	90	2	2				2.2%

Personnel 1 -- Caseloads of special education and related service personnel are within state standards

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	84	9	2	1	1		10.7%
2002-2003	81	3	3				3.7%

Personnel 2 -- The district implements procedures as required for any reported ancillary personnel.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	65	7	1	0			10.8%
2002-2003	55	6	6				10.9%

Personnel 3 -- The district follows proper procedures for hiring, training and reporting paraprofessionals.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	93	8	1	0			8.6%
2002-2003	86	6	6				7.0%

Special Education and Related Services 5 -- The kind and amount of related services is determined by the IEP team based on individual needs rather than factors such as administrative convenience or availability of personnel.

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	79	16	2	1	1		20.3%
2002-2003	40	4	4				10.0%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.
Formulas: Percent of districts reviewed out of compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts/agencies reviewed

Monitoring data show that a relatively low percentage of districts are found out of compliance on standards dealing with special education personnel. Most of the districts found out of compliance those districts have corrected noncompliance by the first follow-up. The most notable decrease in the percentages of noncompliance is seen for caseloads and individualized decisions.

Data also show that 98-99% of districts reviewed have identified and implemented activities that support a Comprehensive System of Professional Development thus indicating that personnel have an avenue to become better prepared to meet the educational needs of children with disabilities.

2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):
Targets had not been set for the 2002-2003 school year. Targets were established in conjunction with the improvement plan which was submitted in July 2003.

3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):
Missouri was in the improvement planning phase of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process during the 2002-2003 school year. Increasing elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities were selected as priority areas by the Part B Steering Committee. Two committees of stakeholders each met for two two-day sessions in April 2003. These committees worked through a root cause analysis and identified strategies and activities that would increase elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities. Both committees identified the training and professional development of general and special education personnel as being critical to increasing performance in the priority areas. These activities began during the 2003-2004 school year.

4. Projected Targets:
- Analyze duties, caseloads, instructional time and certification standards for special education teachers in Missouri.
- Revise data collection on special education personnel as necessary
- Additional projected targets can be found in the Future Activities table.

5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
2.4.1 GS.IV BF.IV	A) Conduct a statewide study regarding the current duties, amounts of instructional time and caseloads for special education personnel.	2.4.1.1 Request for Proposal (RFP) or Invitation for Bid (IFB) developed to conduct study 2.4.1.2 Survey and sample size developed 2.4.1.3 Survey conducted 2.4.1.4 Survey results analyzed 2.4.1.5 Meeting convened with stakeholders regarding results	• Survey report with recommendations available	**Timelines: 2003-2004 Study conducted** **Resources:** Section Responsibility: Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance Funding Type: Part B
2.4.2 GS.IV BF.IV	B) Revise Core Data reporting of special education personnel.	2.4.2.1 Changes to existing core data reporting identified 2.4.2.2 Web screens revised 2.4.2.3 Appropriate district staff trained on changes	• Revision to screen implemented • Revised Personnel Reporting System implemented	**Timelines:** 2004-2005 Revision to screen implemented 2005-2006 System changes implemented **Resources:** Section Responsibility: Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance Funding Type: Part B

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
2.4.3 GS.IV BF.IV	C) Analyze the results of study and core data reporting to determine if changes are needed for special education certification standard/requirements consistent with No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	2.4.3.1 Survey results shared with Teacher and Urban Education Division and other stakeholder groups. 2.4.3.2 Recommendations identified and developed for certification changes if required.	• Recommendations for certification changes, if required, are identified and developed	**Timelines:** 2006-2007 Recommendations identified and developed **Resources:** <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B
2.4.4 GS.IV BF.IV	D) Analyze recommendations to develop strategies/ recommendations for expansion of instructional time for special education personnel.	2.4.4.1 IDEA reauthorization reviewed to determine the impact of changes on reduction of paperwork/and instructional time. 2.4.4.2 Collaboration with stakeholders to develop a grant regarding paperwork reduction and increased instructional time. 2.4.4.3 Report with recommendations regarding instructional time	• Report with recommendations available	**Timelines:** 2006-07 Report complete **Resources:** <u>Section Responsibility</u>: Effective Practices Data Coordination Compliance <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B